

CPYRGHT

25X1A9a

CPYRGHT

What Is One to Think?

In times of trouble, when the political atmosphere is overheated, the wandering trails of free association can—as the late Senator Joseph R. McCarthy demonstrated—lead almost anyone anywhere.

Recently Senator J. William Fulbright inadvertently started up just such a hare's chase. The Senator's research turned up the fact that George A. Carver, Jr., the author of an article on the Vietcong in *Foreign Affairs* which distressed Fulbright, is an intelligence analyst of the CIA. What troubled the Senator, quite rightly, was the failure of the journal's editors to so identify Mr. Carver. What troubles us far more is that such episodes as this and the revelations that CIA funds support university research and technical assistance projects judged to be in the national interest, have set loose an alarming amount of nonsense, this time from liberal quarters.

Take the May 13 issue of *Commonweal*. In an editorial entitled "Suspicion and the CIA," it praised a New York Times series on the agency, brooded over CIA infiltration of academia and *Foreign Affairs*, and finally got around to us: "The February 24 issue of *The Reporter* carried an article on the National Liberation Front by Douglas Pike. In many respects, Mr. Pike's article closely parallels Carver's. *The Reporter* identifies Mr. Pike as 'a specialist in research on the Vietcong for the United States Information Agency in Saigon . . . who recently spent a year at MIT preparing a definitive study of the National Liberation Front.' Now, the MIT Center of International Studies was established in 1951 with CIA money, is headed today by a former CIA assistant director, and only recently formally announced it

was severing its relations with the intelligence agency. Once again, what is one to think?"

Well, there are all sorts of things to think. But first of all we owe it to Mr. Pike to assert patiently that he is indeed an employee of USIA, that he has never been on the CIA payroll, and that his research project at MIT was not supported by CIA funds.

With that out of the way, there are so many things to think it is hard to know where to start. The name Pike, for instance, is a pretty odd one. The first other Pike who comes to mind is the Right Reverend James A. Pike who, come to think of it, recently left his Episcopal bishopric to join up with the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions in Santa Barbara, a think tank which has come out with some pretty radical studies and which was founded by the Ford Foundation's Fund for the Republic, which was once investigated by a Congressional committee under B. Carroll Reece and which is headed by Robert M. Hutchins, who, as everyone knows, was once chancellor of the University of Chicago, which has certainly received millions of dollars of U.S. government grants, including (who knows?) some from the CIA.

Furthermore, according to the New York Times, which ran the famous series on the CIA (just why it has never been explained), Bishop Pike, who has been charged with holding heretical religious doctrines and who admits that he reached his decision to leave his diocese during a six-months' stay abroad (we wonder where?), will be associated at the Santa Barbara Center not only with Mr. Hutchins but with Dr. Linus Pauling, who holds heretical political views and who has attended international conferences with Soviet scientists.

There certainly is an awful lot to think about.